DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 322 827 HE 023 756

AUTHOR Kole, James P.
TITLE An Evaluation of the 1986 Nova University Programs for Higher Education Summer Institute.
PUB DATE Oct 86
NOTE 67p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attendance; Comparative Analysis; Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Institutes (Training Programs); Postsecondary Education as a Field of Study; *Program Effectiveness; Seminars; *Student Attitudes; Summative Evaluation; Summer Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Nova University FL; *Summer Institute Survey (Nova University)

ABSTRACT

The Nova University Programs for Higher Education Summer Institute was evaluated using data collected from two instruments: the Overall Evaluation, a modification of the 1985 Summer Institute Evaluation Form, and the Evaluation of Concurrent Sessions, an instrument utilized for the first time in 1986 to evaluate each concurrent session. These evaluation instruments were also rated as to their effectiveness. Data was compared between the 1985 and 1986 Summer Institutes. The analysis revealed that there was an increase in registered student attendance at the 1986 Summer Institute. In addition, overall registered student specialization seminar attendance increased. The evaluation instruments themselves were rated at "satisfactory" or slightly better. The overall evaluation of the sessions were 3.97 on a 5 point scale (5 = Very Satisfactory). It was felt that the 1986 Summer Institute was a success, that future evaluations are desirable, and that the evaluation forms should be made computer readable. Contains 7 references. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

ED322827

AN EVALUATION OF THE 1986 NOVA UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION SUMMER INSTITUTE

by

James P. Kole, M.Ed.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
JAMES P. KOLE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 023 756

Nova University

Center for the Advancement of Education

Programs for Higher Education

October, 1986

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this investigation was to evaluate the 1986 Nova University Programs for Higher Education Summer Institute. The opinions of Nova Programs for Higher Education students were collected during the 1986 Summer Institute using evaluation instruments. Two instruments were utilized to collect data about the summer institute: (1) the Overall Evaluation, which was a modification of the 1985 Summer Institute evaluation form and (2) the Evaluation of Concurrent Sessions, which was an instrument utilized for the first time in 1986 to evaluate each concurrent session. Therefore, a secondary purpose of this investigation was to evaluate the modified Overall Evaluation instrument and the new concurrent session instrument. In addition, since both of the 1986 Summer Institute instruments were designed to include students, cluster coordinators, presenters, and others, the data collection process and results from each of these groups was reviewed and appropriate recommendations were made for 1987 Summer Institute data collection. A final purpose was to compare the results of the 1986 Summer Institute with the results of the 1985 Summer Institute.

A review of the evaluation results of the 1986 Nova University Programs for Higher Education Summer Institute indicated that the summer institute was an outstanding success. There was an increase in registered student

attendance at the 1986 Summer Institute (1986 N = 258, 1985 N = 249). In addition, overall registered student specialization seminar attendance increased (1986 N = 223, 1985 N = 214). The evaluation return rate of the 1986 Summer Institute was lower than in 1985 (1986 = 63 percent, 1985 = 78 percent). All of the evaluation instrument items were rated at level 3 (Satisfactory) or above with the exception of one "Birds of a Feather" meeting. The overall evaluation of sessions was rated 3.97 on a 5 point scale, 5 = Very Satisfactory, 1 = Very Unsatisfactory. The overall evaluation of Facility was rated 3.95 on the same scale. An analysis of the Facilities data for 1986 suggested that the Marriott Hotel and Marina was less favored than the Sheraton Tucson El Conquistador Golf and Tennis Resort. However, the location of the 1986 institute was preferred over the 1985 (Tucson) location.

A comparative analysis was performed between similar evaluation items on the 1985 and 1986 summer institute evaluation instruments. A t-test was found appropriate to use to make comparisons between the 1985 and 1986 summer institute evaluations on selected items.

A review of 1986 Summer Institute student comments resulted in a list of recommendations for future summer institute planning (See Appendix D). The general categories of recommendations were:

1. time frames of concurrent sessions and overall institute

2. need for orientation and preview of concurrent sessions

3. need for inclusion of Vocational, Technical, and Occupational Education Specializations and Adult Education Specializations into the mainstream of summer institute planning

4. need for a "big name" and interesting keynote speaker

5. need for more "Practicum" and "MARP" help

6. need for audio tapes and "handouts" of concurrent sessions

In conclusion, the 1986 Summer Institute was a success. The need for on-going evaluation of future summer institutes is necessary if continuous improvement is to occur. In addition, the summative evaluation of summer institute evaluation forms is extremely important in deriving accurate and meaningful data. As a result of the evaluation of the 1986 evaluation forms, new evaluation forms that are computer readable have been developed and are included in Appendixes D and E.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
Nature of the Problem	1
Purpose of the Investigation	1
Method of Investigation	3
BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE	5
PROCEDURES	7
Definition of Population	7
Collection of Data	7
Statistical Analysis	8
Null Hypothesis	9
Assumptions and Limitations	9
Definition of Terms	11
RESULTS	13
DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	32
BIBLIOGRAPHY	38
APPENDIXES	
A. NOVA UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR HIGHER EDUCATION 1985 SUMMER INSTITUTE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT	40
B. PROGRAMS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION NOVA UNIVERSITY 1986 SUMMER INSTITUTE OVERALL EVALUATION	43

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

		Page
C.	PROGRAMS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION NOVA UNIVERSITY 1986 EVALUATION OF CONCURRENT SESSIONS	46
D.	OVERALL EVALUATION, PROGRAMS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION SUMMER INSTITUTE (FORMATIVE COMPUTER SCOREABLE FORM)	49
E.	EVALUATION OF CONCURRENT SESSIONS OF PHE SUMMER INSTITUTE (FORMATIVE COMPUTER SCOREABLE FORM)	52
F.	SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF NOVA UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION SUMMER INSTITUTES	55

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Student and Graduate Attendance at the 1986 Nova University Programs for Higher Education Summer Institute by Cluster	14
2.	Nova University Graduate Attendance at the 1986 Programs for Higher Education Summer Institute by Cluster	16
3.	Student Registration by Areas of Specialization and Seminar at the 1986 Nova University Programs for Higher Education Summer Institute	17
4.	Means and Standard Deviations of Student Evaluation of the Overall Evaluation, Sessions and Facility, of the 1986 Nova University Programs for Higher Education Summer Institute	19
5.	Means and Standard Deviations of Student Evaluation of the Sessions and Facility of the 1985 and 1986 Nova University Programs for Higher Education Summer Institutes	21
6.	Comparison of Student Evaluation Results of the 1985 and 1986 Nova University Programs for Higher Education Summer Institutes	23
7.	Means, Standard Deviations, Number of Student Evaluations of Sessions, Type of Sessions, and Presenters at the 1986 Nova University Programs for Higher Education Summer Institute	xx
8.	The Ten Highest Means of Concurrent Sessions at the 1986 Nova University Programs for Higher Education Summer Institute	31

INTRODUCTION

Nature of the Problem

The Programs for Higher Education of Nova University conducted its Fourteenth Annual Summer Institute at the Marriott Hotel and Marina in Fort Lauderdale, Florida from July 27 to August 2, 1986. The theme of the 1986 Summer Institute was "Communication: Dateline 1986." The theme implies that communication is an integral part of all organizations. Fifty-nine concurrent sessions that focused on "communication" were planned and offered to Programs for Higher Education students, faculty, staff, visiting professionals and others at the summer institute.

One of the traditions of the Programs for Higher Education is to conduct a thorough investigation of the outcomes of each summer institute. It is realized by program administrators, faculty, staff and students that future summer institute offerings, procedures, experiences, etc. can be modified for optimum improvement on the basis of the results of annual summative evaluations.

Purpose of the Investigation

Previous summative evaluations and student recommendations of summer institutes suggested that in addition to the regular overall evaluation that a separate evaluation of

each concurrent session should be conducted at the 1986 Summer Institute. MacFarland (1985:26) reported in the 1985 Summer Institute evaluation that it was recommended that "Each presenter should possibly be evaluated separately. Some were not well prepared and detracted from the overall quality." Prior to 1986 concurrent sessions, presenters were collectively evaluated under the general area of Sessions (See Appendix A). The administrators of the Programs for Higher Education suggested that new summer institute evaluation instruments be developed for the 1986 overall evaluation and the individual concurrent sessions. The 1986 Overall Evaluation instrument consisted of two general areas: Sessions and Facility (See Appendix B). The 1986 Evaluation of Concurrent Sessions, conducted the first time at a summer institute, was to evaluate each concurrent session and consisted of specific items related to the content, delivery and overall quality of the presentation (See Appendix C).

Therefore, the purpose of the investigation was to evaluate the 1986 Programs for Higher Education (PHE) Summer Institute, revise the 1985 Overall Evaluation instrument (See Appendixes A and B), develop a formative instrument designed to evaluate each concurrent session (See Appendix C), and wherever possible to generally make a comparative analysis between the 1985 and 1986 Summer Institute evaluations.

Method of Investigation

Prior to the 1986 Summer Institute in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, PHE administrators suggested a need to modify the existing summer institute Overall Evaluation instrument and a need to create a new instrument to evaluate each concurrent session offered. The 1985 Summer Institute evaluation instrument was evaluated and revised. The 1986 Evaluation of Concurrent Sessions instrument was developed after several meetings with PHE administrators, research fellows, and other PHE staff.

The new instruments were designed to gather evaluative ratings and comments from students, presenters, cluster coordinators, and others in attendance at the 1986 Summer Institute. A modified Likert-type method was utilized in the new evaluative instruments. Best (1981:179) indicates that an opinionnaire or attitude scale is an instrument that is designed to measure the attitude or belief of an individual. Best states that opinion and attitude are not synonymous and he provides the following clarification:

> how people feel, or what they believe, is their attitude. But it is difficult, if not impossible, to describe and measure attitude. Researchers must depend upon what people say are their beliefs and feelings. This is the area of opinion. Through the use of questions, or by getting people's expressed reaction to statements, a sample of their opinions is obtained. From this statement of opinion, one may infer or estimate their attitudes--what they really believe (1981:179-180).

Anastasi (1982:552) defines attitude "as a tendency to react favorably or unfavorably toward a designated class of stimuli." Thus, the Likert-type evaluative instruments were designed to measure the attitudes of the students, presenters, cluster coordinators, and others in attendance at the 1986 Programs for Higher Education Summer Institute.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

The Programs for Higher Education of Nova University initiated its first field-based doctoral program for practitioners working in community colleges in 1972. Over the past fourteen years, the field-based doctoral program has evolved to include practitioners working in higher education, vocational education, and adult education (including business, industrial, and military training programs).

Nova's field-based doctoral program integrates formal instruction, independent study, and applied research into a comprehensive learning experience. All students must complete five "core" seminars:

ECD 8003 - Curriculum and Program Planning

ECD 8007 - Governance and Management

ECD 8011 - Applied Educational Research and Evaluation

ECD 8016 - Learning Theory and Applications

ECD 8021 - Societal Factors Affecting Education.

In addition, two "specialization" seminars must be completed according to the specialization area of the student. The specialization seminars presented at the 1986 Summer Institute included:

EAD 8002 - History, Philosophy, and Practices of Adult Education

EHD 8002 - Politics, Law and Economics of Higher Education

EHD 8006 - Emergence of Higher Education in America

ETD 8002 - Personnel-Human Resources Development

Another required aspect of the field-based doctoral program is attendance at two summer institutes. Summer institutes are described in the Nova University Programs for Higher Education 1986-87 Catalog (13)

> Each student must attend two summer institutes. Summer institutes are week-long events that bring together students, cluster coordinators, practicum evaluators, MARP advisors, national lecturers, central staff, and nationally known educators to express and share ideas. Material is presented that explores the deeper implications of the seminars and that elaborates on the application of theory to current issues in education. Both formal and informal activities provide ample opportunities for mutual teaching and learning among students and other educators from all across the country. Many students find the summer institute to be one of the most stimulating and rewarding aspects of the program. Since 1977 an annual Practitioners' Hall of Fame has been held during the summer institute. This event provides a forum for practitioners to share with others new, innovative, or in some way unique projects that they have successfully undertaken. In this way, the problems and concerns of those in the "front lines" of education are addresssed, and solutions that are within the means of most practitioners are articulated. Papers selected for presentation at the Practitioners' Hall of Fame are acquired through a national call for papers.

Participation of the student, graduate, presenter, cluster coordinator, visiting professional, staff and others at the annual summer institute enhances an integration of theory, applied research, creative ideas and fellowship where common problems are identified and possible solutions are discussed. The Nova University summer institute stands alone in the higher education literature but no doubt other institutions may soon follow Nova's lead.

PROCEDURES

Definition of Population

The population investigated consisted of approximately 260 Programs for Higher Education students, 11 of which were graduates. In addition, there were 16 cluster coordinators, 39 presenters, and a number of others in attendance at the 1986 Programs for Higher Education Summer Institute. An exact number is not known due to the fact that some graduates and possibly other visiting professionals did not complete the registration form. All registered students were provided with summer institute evaluation forms. The forms were distributed by the students' cluster coordinators and were contained in presenters' and others' packets.

Collection of Data

The Programs for Higher Education central office provided numerous records in relation to the 1986 Summer Institute. Records such as general student registration, student and graduate registration by cluster, number of graduate students attending the postdoctoral individual study course, etc. were made available. In addition, the central office provided the evaluation results of the

1985 Summer Institute upon which comparisons were made with the results of the 1986 Summer Institute evaluations. Best (1981:179) states that "the information form that attempts to measure the attitude or belief of an individual is known as an opinionnaire, or attitude scale." According to Anastasi (1982:552)

> Attitude scales . . . typically yield a total score indicating the direction and intensity of the individual's attitude toward a company, group of people, policy, or other stimulus category. In the construction of an attitude scale, the different questions are designed to measure a single attitude or unidimensional variable, and some objective procedures are usually followed in the effort to approach this goal.

Statistical Analysis

According to Best (1981:257) statistical analysis is the mathematical process of gathering, organizing, analyzing, and interpreting numerical data, and is one of the basic phases of the research process. Likert-type rating scales were utilized in both evaluative instruments--the Overall Evaluation and the Evaluation of Concurrent Sessions. In this study a comparative analysis was performed between similar evaluation items on the 1985 and 1986 Summer Institute evaluation instruments. A discriminant function analysis was used to compare student perceptions of the 1984 Summer Institute to the 1985 Summer Institute (MacFarland, 1985:3). The 1986 Summer Institute evaluation instruments were different than the 1985 evaluation instrument. Therefore, selected items were chosen to be compared.

Independent t-tests were used to test the difference in the similar evaluation items between the 1985 and 1986 Summer Institute evaluations.

Null Hypothesis

With regard to student evaluation of the 1985 and 1986 Nova University Programs for Higher Education Summer Institutes--there is no significant difference in the mean ratings of selected items between the 1985 and 1986 Summer Institute evaluations.

Assumptions and Limitations

Since the 1986 Summer Institute evaluation instruments were designed to measure the opinions of students, presenters, cluster coordinators and others, it was assumed that the data collected at the completion of the summer institute would reflect the attitudes of each of the above groups. It was also assumed that the questions comprising each of the 1986 summer institute evaluation instruments were unambiguous to those completing them. Another assumption made was that an evaluation return rate of 63 percent would be sufficient to allow inferences to be made about the approximate 260 students in attendance. Finally, it was assumed that since the number of individuals in attendance at the 1985 and 1986 Summer Institutes was roughly equal, comparisons could be made between the student evaluations of each summer institute. Although some minor

changes were made on the 1986 Overall Evaluation, only items that were similar were compared with the 1986 Summer Institute evaluation results.

One limitation of this investigation was the lack of a test for internal consistency on the 1986 Summer Institute evaluation forms. Best (1981:181) states that

> after the statements have been gathered, a trial test should be administered to a number of subjects. Only those items that correlate with the total test should be retained. This testing for internal consistency will help to eliminate statements that are ambiguous or that are not of the same type as the rest of the scale.

Because the 1986 evaluation instruments were revised and developed one week prior to the summer institute, time constraints disallowed a complete test for internal consistency.

Best (1981:180) suggests that the process of inferring attitude from expressed opinion has numerous limitations.

> People may conceal their attitudes and express socially acceptable opinions. They may not really know how they feel about a social issue; they may never have given the idea serious consideration. People may be unaware of their attitude about a situation in the abstract. Until confronted with a real situation, they may be unable to predict their reaction or behavior.

Best (1981:180) further states that

> Even though there is no sure method of describing and measuring attitude, the description and measurement of opinion, in many instances, may be closely related to people's real feelings or attitudes.

Definition of Terms

There are a number of terms and corresponding definitions listed below that will assist the reader in understanding the various aspects of the Nova University Programs for Higher Education field-based Ed.D. degree, program structure, requirements, etc.

Attitude: For the purpose of this paper, the measurement of attitude is an approximation of a person's or a group's expressed opinions or feelings about something. The American Heritage Dictionary, Second College Edition (1985:141) defines attitude as "a state of mind or feeling with regard to some matter."

"Birds of a Feather" Meetings: These are general sessions that are concurrently presented each year at the Programs for Higher Education summer institute where students, graduates, and others who are employed in similar professional positions meet and discuss contemporary concerns.

Cluster Coordinator: "This person is the liaison between the cluster and the central staff. The coordinator has academic responsibilities as well as housekeeping chores" (Self Study 1983-85:314).

Clusters: All Programs for Higher Education students are organized into groups called local or regional clusters. "Clusters provide the vehicle through which instruction and

other services are provided to students" (Nova University Programs for Higher Education 1986-87 Catalog:2).

MARP: "The major applied research project (MARP) is the capstone of doctoral study. MARPs are much like practicums, only much more ambitious and rigorous. Whereas practicums are designed to sharpen skills in planning and conducting applied research, the MARP is the final demonstration that those skills have been mastered" (Nova University Programs for Higher Education 1986-87 Catalog:12).

Practicums: "are applied research projects that are designed to promote the solution to current problems in the student's institution" (Nova University Programs for Higher Education 1986-87 Catalog:12).

Practitioners' Hall of Fame: An event at the annual summer institute that provides a forum for practitioners to share innovative projects that they have successfully completed with those present at the institute.

Specialization Seminars: "These are seminars especially designed and required in each of the three specialization areas" (Self Study 1983-85:315).

RESULTS

There were approximately 260 students and graduates in attendance at the Fourteenth Annual 1986 Nova University Programs for Higher Education Summer Institute. There were 247 registered students and 11 graduates of the Programs for Higher Education field-based Ed.D. degree present at the summer institute. In addition there were 16 cluster coordinators, 39 presenters, a number of visiting professionals, and others in attendance. Student and graduate attendance at the 1986 Nova University Programs for Higher Education Summer Institute is presented, by cluster, in Table 1. The four clusters with the largest registrations at the 1986 summer institute were: Greenwood, South Carolina (n = 24), Massachusetts (n = 23), Philadelphia (n = 21), and Tampa (n = 22).

The Nova University graduate attendance by cluster at the 1986 summer institute is listed in Table 2. Three of the eleven Nova Programs for Higher Education Ed.D. graduates registered for the postdoctoral individual study course. The postdoctoral students were from the Orlando-Alpha, Tampa and Dallas clusters. A description of the postdoctoral individual study course follows.

> ECD 8062 - Postdoctoral Individual Study Course
> The graduate will attend the summer institute and interact with colleagues. Upon completion of the summer institute, the graduate will write a synthesis paper containing statements of how the summer institute

experiences will be helpful in the author's institution. One of the important objectiv s of the course is to have graduates apply to practice the theories gained from the summer institute in making improvements in institutions. Three semester hours will be awarded for successful completion of this postdoctoral study (unpublished document).

Table 1

Student and Graduate Attendance at the 1986 Nova University Programs for Higher Education Summer Institute by Cluster

Cluster	Number of Students	Percent of Total
Alabama	1	0.38
Alaska	3	1.16
Brevard	1 *	0.38
Chicago	11 *	4.26
Dallas	17 *	6.60
Fort Bragg	7 *	2.71
Greenwood	24	9.30
Massachusetts	23	8.91
Milwaukee	5 *	1.93
Morehead City	1	0.40
North Miami	1 *	0.38
Long Island	1 *	0.38
Los Angeles Beta	1 *	0.38
Oakland	12	4.65
Philadelphia	21	8.15
Phoenix	2	0.77
Santa Ana	20	7.75

Table 1 (Continued)

Cluster	Number of Students	Percent of Total
South Florida	20	7.75
Tampa	22 *	8.54
Vermont	2 **	0.77
Virginia	9	3.50
West Florida	12	4.65
Atlanta Regional	5	1.94
Birmingham Regional	5	1.94
Denver Regional	18	6.99
Hong Kong Regional	14	5.43
TOTAL	258	100.00

* 1 graduate
** 2 graduates

The Programs for Higher Education of Nova University offers three specialization areas to practitioners in higher education: Leadership in Adult Education; Higher Education; and Vocational, Technical, and Occupational Education. All Nova University Programs for Higher Education students are required to complete two specialization seminars. Students may take one specialization seminar at each of two summer institutes. Student registration by specialization area at

the 1986 Summer Institute is indicated in Table 3. The Specialization in Higher Education had the highest student representation at the summer institute (n = 143), the next highest student representation was the Specialization in Vocational, Technical, and Occupational Education (n = 41), and finally the Specialization in Leadership in Adult Education (n = 39).

Table 2

Nova University Graduate Attendance at the 1986 Programs for Higher Education Summer Institute by Cluster

Cluster	Number of Students
Chicago	1
Dallas	1 *
Fort Bragg	1
Tampa	1 *
Long Island	1
Milwaukee	1
North Miami	1
Orlando-Alpha	1 *
Vermont	2
TOTAL	11

* Attended Postdoctoral Individual Study Course

Table 3

Student Registration by Areas of Specialization and Seminar at the 1986 Nova University Programs for Higher Education Summer Institute

Specialization Area and Seminar	Number of Students	Percent of Total
Specialization in Higher Education		
EHD 8002 Politics, Law and Economics of Higher Education	77	34.5
EHD 8006 Emergence of Higher Education in America	66	29.6
SUBTOTAL	143	64.1
Specialization in Leadership in Adult Education		
EAD 8002 History, Philosophy, and Practices of Adult Education in America	39	17.5
Specialization in Vocational, Technical, and Occupational Education		
ETD 8002 Personnel-Human Resources Development	41	18.4
TOTAL	223	100.0

The 1986 Summer Institute was evaluated by the use of two forms. The Overall Evaluation consisted of two parts: Sessions and Facility. There were seven items and eleven items respectively (See Appendix B). The other form used in the evaluation of the 1986 Summer Institute was Evaluation of

Concurrent Sessions. There were eleven items to be rated on the forms (See Appendix C). Both forms utilized a Likert-type rating scale. A rating of five represented Very Satisfactory and a rating of one represented Very Unsatisfactory. Of the approximately 260 students and graduates in attendance at the 1986 Summer Institute, 163 students completed and returned the evaluation forms. Evaluation forms were not completed by cluster coordinators, presenters, graduates, visiting professionals or others.

Means and standard deviations of the items included on the Overall Evaluation of the 1986 Summer Institute are listed in Table 4. Means and standard deviations of the items relating to the Sessions and Facility of the 1985 and 1986 Summer Institutes are listed in Table 5. A visual comparison of the 1985 and 1986 Sessions results shows that, in every instance, the 1986 means were higher than the 1985 means. However, the exact opposite occurred with the Facility comparison--in every instance with the exception of "location of the institute" where the 1985 means were higher than the 1986 means.

A comparison of student evaluation results of the 1985 and the 1986 Summer Institutes is presented in Table 6. A t-test was used to compare the student evaluation results and they are presented in Table 6.

For the first time in the history of Nova University Programs for Higher Education summer institutes, individual concurrent sessions and presenters were evaluated. Prior to

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations of Student Evaluation of the Overall Evaluation, Sessions and Facility, of the 1986 Nova University Programs for Higher Education Summer Institute

Item	Mean	SD
SESSIONS		
1. Number of concurrent sessions per day	3.96	1.00
2. Time between sessions	3.91	1.13
3. Coffee breaks	4.11	1.03
4. Use of tables and chairs	3.97	1.00
5. Number of planning meetings	3.78	1.02
6. Value of planning meetings	3.82	1.09
7. Helpfulness of central staff	4.24	1.01
TOTAL	3.97	1.04
FACILITIES		
1. Location of institute	4.03	1.10
2. Check-in process	4.06	1.09
3. Sleeping rooms	4.12	0.90
4. Food service	3.61	1.18
5. Cluster meeting rooms	4.00	0.95
6. Session meeting rooms	4.00	0.94
7. Hotel personnel	4.20	0.93
8. Overall quality	4.10	0.85
9. Parking arrangements	3.77	1.21

Table 4 (Continued)

Item		Mean	SD
10.	Hotel temperature	3.36	1.31
11.	Hotel lighting	3.99	1.04
	TOTAL	3.93	1.05
	OVERALL	3.95	1.04

the 1986 Summer Institute all sessions were evaluated collectively on one Overall Evaluation form. In 1986, students completed one Overall Evaluation form and one Evaluation of Concurrent Sessions form for each concurrent session attended. There were 39 concurrent session presenters and 59 concurrent sessions since some presenters offered two or more programs at the 1986 Summer Institute. The means, standard deviations, number of students completing the concurrent sessions evaluations, type of sessions, and presenters are listed in Table 7. It appears that the three most heavily attended concurrent sessions were: (1) Barrett - "What Does Nova Really Want?--Improving Your Writing to Get Approval of Proposals and Practicums" (n = 115), (2) Herrscher - "A Primer on Research Design" (n = 111), and (3) Kelly - "Campus Leadership: Managing and Marketing Through Effective Communication" (n = 99).

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations of Student Evaluation of the Sessions and Facility of the 1985 and 1986 Nova University Programs for Higher Education Summer Institutes

	1985		1986	
Item	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
SESSIONS				
Keynote address	3.25	1.15	3.25	1.30
Panel discussion	3.08	1.14	3.31	1.07
Information Retrieval Service sessions	4.19	1.59	4.61	0.71
Practicum help sessions	4.26	1.88	4.42	0.82
MARP sessions	3.88	1.26	4.59	0.91
"Birds of a Feather" meetings	3.12	1.63	4.05	1.12
Practitioners' Hall of Fame	3.46	1.41	4.28	0.87
Educational value to you	3.82	0.96	4.23	0.85
Relevancy to your needs	3.58	1.00	4.22	0.95
Length of sessions	3.99	0.96	4.40	0.92
Availability of presenters to students	3.98	1.04	4.39	0.79
Promoted scholarly and intellectual stimulation	3.79	1.04	4.22	0.88
FACILITY				
Sleeping rooms	4.68	0.98	4.12	0.90
Meeting rooms	4.34	1.03	4.00	0.94
Food service	3.71	1.40	3.61	1.18
Check-in process	4.31	1.18	4.06	1.09

Table 5 (Continued)

Item	1985 Mean	1985 SD	1986 Mean	1986 SD
Parking arrangements	4.39	1.39	3.77	1.21
Hotel personnel	4.59	0.74	4.20	0.93
Overall quality	4.44	1.02	4.10	0.85
Location of institute	3.65	1.41	4.03	1.10

The ten concurrent sessions rated highest by students completing the Evaluation of Concurrent Sessions are listed in Table 8. The highest mean (4.87) was attributed to Alford - "Using Computers to Analyze Prose."

Table 6

Comparison of Student Evaluation Results of the 1985 and 1986 Nova University Programs for Higher Education Summer Institutes

	1985		1986		
Item	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t-value
Keynote address	3.25	1.15	3.25	1.30	0.00
Panel discussion	3.08	1.14	3.31	1.07	0.78
Information Retrieval Service sessions	4.19	1.59	4.61	0.71	2.26 *
Practicum help sessions	4.26	1.88	4.42	0.82	0.89
MARP sessions	3.88	1.26	4.59	0.91	2.20 *
"Birds of a Feather" meetings	3.12	1.63	4.05	1.12	3.30 ***
Practitioners' Hall of Fame	3.46	1.41	4.28	0.87	6.32 ***
Educational value to you	3.82	0.96	4.23	0.85	4.04 ***
Relevancy to your needs	3.58	1.00	4.22	0.95	5.92 ***
Length of sessions	3.99	0.96	4.40	0.92	3.88 ***
Availability of presenters to students	3.98	1.04	4.39	0.79	4.01 ***
Promoted scholarly and intellectual stimulation	3.79	1.04	4.22	0.88	4.32 ***
Sleeping rooms	4.68	0.98	4.12	0.90	5.37 ***
Meeting rooms	4.34	1.03	4.00	0.94	3.12 **
Food service	3.71	1.40	3.61	1.18	0.70
Check-in process	4.31	1.18	4.06	1.09	2.00 *
Parking arrangements	4.39	1.39	3.77	1.21	4.32 ***

Table 6 (Continued)

Item	1985 Mean	1985 SD	1986 Mean	1986 SD	t-value
Hotel personnel	4.59	0.74	4.20	0.93	4.23 ***
Overall quality	4.44	1.02	4.10	0.85	3.27 **
Location of institute	3.65	1.41	4.03	1.10	2.72 **
Helpfulness of central staff	4.36	1.22	4.24	1.01	0.95

* significance level < .05
** significance level < .01
*** significance level < .001

Table 7

Means, Standard Deviations, Number of Student Evaluations of Sessions, Type of Sessions, and Presenters at the 1986 Nova University Programs for Higher Education Summer Institute

Type of Session	Presenter	Session Title	Mean	SD	N
C	Alford	Using Computers to Analyze Prose	4.87	0.46	9
K	Alfred	Advancing Community Colleges Toward the 1990s: Public Policy, Positioning Alternatives, and New Partnerships	4.27	0.87	35
C	Austin	Preview of Governance and Management Seminar	4.65	0.64	8
C	Austin	"Don't Let Your Mouth Write a Check That Your Body Can't Cash"	3.66	1.13	53
C	Barrett	What Does Nova Really Want?--Improving Your Writing to Get Approval of Proposals and Practicums	4.61	0.85	115
C	Belcher	Communicating Research and Evaluation Results to Improve Decision Making	4.06	0.91	46
C	Belcher	Measuring Communication Skills at the Sophomore Level: The Role of Entering Basic Skills and the Curriculum	4.04	0.97	22
H	Campanella	Managing in the Information Age: The Boston College Experience	4.11	0.94	52
C	Centini	Electronic Delivery of External Degree Programs	4.52	0.71	13

Table 7 (Continued)

Type of Session	Presenter	Session Title	Mean	SD	N
B	Collins, Stepien	Birds of a Feather: Science and Math	3.93	1.46	10
C	Fischler	Nova University: Positioned for the Twenty-First Century	4.43	0.81	55
C	Groff	Communications and Information Skills in a Technical Society	4.35	0.93	31
B	Groff, Cooper	Birds of a Feather: Nursing and Health	4.01	1.10	16
C	Herrscher	A Primer on Research Design	4.58	0.87	111
C	Herrscher	Dateline 1986: The Technology of Classroom Practice	4.26	0.51	74
C	Herrscher	Preview of Curriculum and Programs Planning Seminar	4.53	0.86	33
B	Hinton	Birds of a Feather: Student Personnel Services	3.51	1.03	9
C	Kelly	Campus Leadership: Managing and Marketing Through Effective Communication	3.82	1.12	99
C	Losak	Effective Communication of Research Findings	4.02	1.10	65
C	Losak	Is Remiss Communication a Cause or an Effect?	4.35	1.09	38
C	Losak	Preview of Learning Theory and Applications Seminar	4.18	1.15	14

Table 7 (Continued)

Type of Session	Presenter	Session Title	Mean	SD	N
C	Losak, Rankin	Practicum Help Session	4.50	0.92	26
C	MacFarland	An Investigation of Portfolio Use for Nova University Programs for Higher Education Applicants	4.19	1.16	10
C	MacFarland, Switzer	Practicums: Their Role in the Nova Experience	3.80	1.28	90
C	Matson	MARP session	4.96	0.89	5
C	Mehallis	What You See is What You Get	4.59	0.59	15
C	Melchiori	What Every Administrator and Faculty Member Should Know About Fund Raising (Part I)	3.62	1.00	36
C	Melchiori	What Every Administrator and Faculty Member Should Know About Fund Raising (Part II)	3.97	0.89	18
H	Mills	Communications About Adult Learning: Transition and Renewal in Continuing Education at the University of Charleston	4.37	0.87	58
C	Mizell	Communicating With the Future	4.67	0.57	29
B	Morgan, Tamburello	Birds of a Feather: Military and Adult Education	4.47	0.90	9
B	Nawy, Robinson	Birds of a Feather: Social Science	4.63	1.11	5

Table 7 (Continued)

Type of Session	Presenter	Session Title	Mean	SD	N
C	Newell	MARP Session	4.22	0.93	18
H	Osborn	Does Your Planning Communicate Action or Is Your Strategic Plan A Coffee Table Book?	4.18	0.94	60
C	Pautler	Educational Partnerships: Community College and Corporate Training Programs	3.96	1.06	29
C	Poliner	Nova's I.R.S.: Meeting Your Research Needs (Lecture)	4.44	1.00	39
C	Poliner	Nova's I.R.S.: Meeting Your Research Needs (Workshop)	4.74	0.48	25
C	Poliner	Nova's I.R.S.: Selecting Online Service and Databases	4.66	0.65	22
C	Rankin	Preview of Applied Research Seminar	4.36	0.75	9
C	Rankin, Collins	Practicum Help Session	4.35	0.73	14
C	Richards	Any Computer Can Communicate: A Survey of the Electronic Universe	4.35	0.86	51
H	Richards	Faculty and the Distance Learner: Communicating via Computer Conferencing	4.46	0.72	52
P	Richards, Kelly, Centini, Alfred	Panel Discussion--"Communication: Dateline 1986"	3.31	1.07	28

Table 7 (Continued)

Type of Session	Presenter	Session Title	Mean	SD	N
C	Scigliano	Computer-Based Communication	4.35	0.85	42
C	Scigliano	Improving Communication Through Artificial Intelligence, Expert Systems, and Database Management	4.19	0.99	36
C	Scigliano	Preview of Governance and Management Seminar	3.88	1.31	21
B	Sharples	Birds of a Feather: Administration	2.12	1.15	42
C	Van Dalsen	Communication Means Listening Too!	4.31	0.75	27
C	Van Dalsen	The Non-Verbal Messages of Communication	3.96	1.11	47
C	Varcoe	Effective Communications: A Key to the Process of Change	4.07	0.94	28
C	Varcoe	Strategic Planning and Communications Enhancement	4.55	0.64	12
C	Varcoe	Preview of Societal Factors Affecting Education Seminar	4.54	0.66	15
C	Wright	Identifying and Correcting Dysfunctional Communication Patterns in Formal Organizations	4.45	0.78	23
C	Wright	Persuasion and Attitude Change: An Important Outcome of Effective Communication	3.61	1.40	46

Table 7 (Continued)

Type of Session	Presenter	Session Title	Mean	SD	N
C	Wright	Preview of Learning Theory and Application Seminar	4.36	0.79	8
C	Zierath	Communication in the Information Society: Impersonal and Interpersonal Relations in the Postmodern Era	3.65	1.14	16
C	Zierath	Knowledge, Communication, and Intellectual Leadership in the Information Society	3.61	1.27	24
MEAN			4.19	0.92	34.2

B Birds of a Feather
C Concurrent Session
H Practitioners' Hall of Fame
K Keynote Address
P Panel Discussion

Table 8

The Ten Highest Means of Concurrent Sessions at the 1986 Nova University Programs for Higher Education Summer Institute

Presenter	Concurrent Session	Mean
Alford	Using Computers to Analyze Prose	4.87
Poliner	Nova's I.R.S.: Meeting Your Research Needs (Workshop)	4.74
Mizell	Communicating With the Future	4.67
Poliner	Nova's I.R.S.: Selecting Online Services and Databases	4.66
Barrett	What Does Nova Really Want?--Improving Your Writing to Get Approval of Proposals and Practicums	4.61
Mehallis	What You See is What You Get	4.59
Austin	Purposes of Communication	4.58
Herrscher	A Primer on Research Design	4.58
Varcoe	Strategic Planning and Communications Enhancement	4.55
Centini	Electronic Delivery of External Degree Programs	4.52

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, the Fourteenth Annual Programs for Higher Education Summer Institute was a successful endeavor. Students in attendance at the institute rated all of the Sessions and Facility items on the 1986 Overall Evaluation as Satisfactory or above. Of the fifty-nine individual concurrent session evaluations by students all but one rated Satisfactory or above. A comment section on each of the two evaluation instruments provided additional evidence of the success of the 1986 Summer Institute. A sample of supportive comments is listed below.

1. "Overall, concurrent sessions were excellent. Choice of topics was timely."

2. "Very informative institute."

3. "I found the institute helpful. My national lecturer was excellent."

4. "Very good institute. The information provided was very helpful. Very impressed with Nova Central Staff and their willingness to provide supportive information."

5. "Well organized, especially Dr. Moreton's welcome. It set an up-beat tone."

6. "As a 'first year' student, this conference was a very helpful experience, i.e., (1) Using Nova resources, (2) Help sessions re: practicums, MARP, and up-coming seminars, (3) Sessions on strategic planning, (4) Adult

Education seminar was excellent, and was augmented by excellent contributions of participant groups."

7. "Dr. Kintzer was an excellent lecturer. The sessions were informative, the assignments were meaningful, and very useful in job situation."

8. "Excellent planning and execution of an event so large in scale."

9. "Hall of Fame Presentations (Sessions II and III were excellent"

10. "Really enjoyable Hall of Fame--Excellent!"

Some favorable comments that were listed on the Facility section of the 1986 Overall Evaluation of the summer institute follow.

1. "Bring binoculars--great harbor!"

2. "Excellent accommodations."

3. "Again someone is doing excellent planning."

4. "Hotel personnel: excellent. The overall quality was very good. Parking arrangements were surprisingly good."

5. "I appreciate the reasonable room rate."

6. "Good, convenient, moderately priced, clean facility with budget dining in area. Thank you!"

7. "Tremendous location and service."

8. "Hotel facilities were superb. Personnel at the front desk were immediately responsive to inform me of facilities and other questions that I had from time-to-time."

9. "An excellent spot; reasonable, with first class facilities.

Students also were quick to point out areas of frustration. A representative sample of student concerns follows.

1. "The planned activities for the day are too long."

2. "Fifteen minutes between sessions preferable to 30 minutes."

3. "I feel the institute could be accomplished in a shorter time frame."

4. "The time between sessions: 15 minutes is adequate, don't need 30 minutes?"

5. "It would have been helpful if some of the time allotted to concurrent sessions be directed to issues associated with specialization seminars by individuals other than the specialization seminar instructor. Example: in Politics, Law and Economics of Higher Education, have a lawyer and/or an economist speak on special issues."

6. "I attended a session during every time period... I think the requirement to attend 80 percent of the sessions is a little too high--60 percent is more realistic."

7. "Interesting, but 'the mind can only absorb what the seat endureth.'"

8. "The Summer Institute is a bit long. Perhaps if it were decreased by 1/2 day, over-all interest would stay higher."

9. "Next time have 2 days of classes, 2 days of sessions and 1 day of previews."

10. "The inclusion of other types of media formats would have been desirable. Techniques of creating good video materials and use of television courses for credit are two examples of communication media being developed. Computers are important but they are not the only technical tool available."

11. "Would have been nice to have a "Birds of a Feather" session for VTO people."

12. "I would strongly recommend that VTO people have a separate "Birds of a Feather" session from all other groups."

13. "Adult Education Specialization needs to be included in topics for concurrent sessions that focus more on Adult Education, Principles and Practices. The majority of the sessions were focused on Higher Education."

14. "There is a severe lack of sessions useful to the Adult Education practitioner who works in a non-college setting. This criticism was also lodged last year!!"

15. "Please get more interesting keynote speakers."

16. "A half-hour orientation session at the beginning would have helped. We also needed an impartial 'chaplain' for those who were not coping well with stress."

17. "Did not receive schedule of events ahead of time. I found out about the Sunday P.M. session only by accident."

18. "Need to have program at least one week in advance!"

19. "Instead of 'Birds of a Feather' occurring during the day, perhaps a session could be scheduled in the evening in a relaxed atmosphere so that participants are encouraged to communicate. Perhaps there would be special interest groups organized around topic rather than occupation."

20. "Could have used Practicum/MARP session on Wednesday morning while most were in seminars. However, only 3rd year students would be free to attend, but there are many of them."

21. "Some second year students are very interested in meeting with their MARP Advisor. The dialogue which follows needs time to take place. That dialogue can best be done right here, face to face, to focus efforts, prior to returning home. Recommendation: start all the MARP sessions on Tuesday instead of Thursday. Otherwise a lot of pressure and time demands are placed on both students/advisors on Thursday and Friday. One-on-one time with advisors also needs to be allocated, perhaps in the evening."

22. "Should not have eliminated one of the two MARP sessions!!! If the MARP is the 'cornerstone' of this program, why wasn't a solution for the missed MARP session provided???"

23. "I would recommend making available to summer institute participants, tapes of the sessions pertinent to their areas. . . . Make available outlines of sessions."

The above listed concerns and frustrations of students in attendance at the 1986 Summer Institute can be reduced to the following: (1) time frames of the concurrent sessions and institute, (2) need for orientation and previews of concurrent sessions, (3) need for inclusion of Vocational, Technical, Occupational Education Specialization and Adult Education Specialization into the mainstream of summer institutes i.e., "Birds of a Feather," concurrent session topics, etc., (4) need for "big name" and interesting keynote speaker, (5) need for more "practicum" and "MARP" help, (6) need for tapes and "hand-outs" of concurrent sessions.

As a result of the analysis of the 1986 Nova University Programs for Higher Education Summer Institute evaluations, a summary of recommendations is listed in Appendix F. In addition, formative, computer-readable evaluation forms have been developed (Please see Appendixes D and E) for future summer institute evaluations. The use of computer-readable forms will tend to make the task of collation at the conclusion of summer institutes a more manageable and time efficient process.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anastasi, Anne. Psychological Testing. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, Incorporated, 1982.

"Attitude". The American Heritage Dictionary, Second College Edition.

Best, John W. Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1981.

MacFarland, Thomas W. "An Analysis of the 1985 Nova University Center for Higher Education Summer Institute." Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University, December, 1985.

Nova University Programs for Higher Education Catalog 1986-1987.

Postdoctoral Individual Study Course, Unpublished document.

Self Study 1983-1985, Nova University. Submitted to Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Atlanta, Georgia, March, 1985.

APPENDIX A

NOVA UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR HIGHER EDUCATION 1985

SUMMER INSTITUTE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

NOVA UNIVERSITY

CENTER FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

1985 SUMMER INSTITUTE EVALUATION FORM

NAME: _____ CLUSTER: _____

Number of Summer Institutes Attended _____

Please give us your opinion of the following components of the Thirteenth Annual Summer Institute. Rate each component on the following scale by circling your response.

1 2 3 4 5
Very Unsatisfactory Very Satisfactory

SESSIONS

	Educational value to you	1	2	3	4	5	
2.	Relevancy to your needs	1	2	3	4	5	
3.	Informative	1	2	3	4	5	
4.	Length of time of sessions	1	2	3	4	5	
5.	Availability of presenters to students	1	2	3	4	5	
6.	Group discussion was encouraged	1	2	3	4	5	
7.	Promoted scholarly and intellectual stimulation	1	2	3	4	5	

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

FACILITY

8.	Sleeping rooms	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9.	Meeting rooms	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10.	Food service	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

F' ility (Cont.)

11. Check-in process	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
12. Check-out process	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
13. Parking arrangements	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
14. Hotel personnel	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
15. Overall quality	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
16. Location of institute	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

Comments:

SPECIFIC COMPONENTS

17. Keynote Speech	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
18. Monday's Panel Discussion	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
19. Information Retrieval Service Sessions	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
20. Practicum Help Sessions						
Individual	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Group	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
21. MARP Sessions	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
22. "Birds of a Feather" Meetings	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
23. Practitioners' Hall of Fame	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
24. Helpfulness of Central Staff	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

Comments:

APPENDIX B

PROGRAMS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION NOVA UNIVERSITY

1986 SUMMER INSTITUTE OVERALL EVALUATION

PROGRAMS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

1986 Summer Institute

OVERALL EVALUATION

Directions: Please identify yourself by circling the appropriate category

1. Student
2. Presenter
3. Cluster Coordinator
4. Other _____

Please give your reactions to the following components by circling 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or N/A.

1 2 3 4 5

Very Unsatisfactory — Very Satisfactory

Sessions

1.	The number of concurrent sessions per day	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2.	The time between sessions	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3.	The coffee breaks	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4.	Use of tables and chairs	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5.	The number of planning meetings	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6.	The value of planning meetings	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7.	Helpfulness of central staff	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

(over)

8. Other: _____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Facility

1. Location of institute	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2. Check-in process	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3. Sleeping rooms	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4. Food service	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5. Cluster meeting rooms	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6. Session meeting rooms	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7. Hotel personnel	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8. Overall quality	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9. Parking arrangements	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10. Hotel temperature	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
11. Hotel lighting	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX C

PROGRAMS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION NOVA UNIVERSITY 1986

EVALUATION OF CONCURRENT SESSIONS

PROGRAMS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

1986 Summer Institute

EVALUATION OF CONCURRENT SESSIONS

Name of Presenter: _____

Date: _____ Time: _____

Directions: Please identify yourself by circling the appropriate category

1. Student
2. Presenter
3. Cluster Coordinator
4. Other _____

Please give your reactions to the following components by circling 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or N/A.

	1 Very Unsatisfactory	2	3	4	5 Very Satisfactory	
1. Educational value	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2. Promoted scholarly and intellectual stimulation	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3. Group discussion was encouraged	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4. Utilized various teaching methods to allow for diverse learner needs	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5. Availability of presenters to students	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6. Length of sessions	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7. The quality of handouts	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

(over)

8. Use of audio visual	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9. The extent to which the presenter was well prepared	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10. Relevancy to your needs	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
11. Clarity of presentation	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

12. Other: _____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX D

OVERALL EVALUATION, PROGRAMS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION SUMMER INSTITUTE (FORMATIVE COMPUTER SCOREABLE FORM)

OVERALL EVALUATION, PROGRAMS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
SUMMER INSTITUTE

Directions on back. 1-8 = Sessions 9-20 = Facility

KEY	1 (T)	2 (F)	3		5	
1	A	B	C	D	E	1. The number of concurrent sessions per day
2	A	B	C	D	E	2. The time between sessions
3	A	B	C	D	E	3. Length of sessions
4	A	B	C	D	E	4. Refreshment breaks
5	A	B	C	D	E	5. Use of tables and chairs
6	A	B	C	D	E	6. Helpfulness of central staff
7	A	B	C	D	E	7. The appropriateness and value of the institute theme
8	A	B	C	D	E	8. Institute integration sessions
9	A	B	C	D	E	9. Length of sessions
10	A	B	C	D	E	10. Location of institute
11	A	B	C	D	E	11. Check-in process
12	A	B	C	D	E	12. Sleeping rooms
13	A	B	C	D	E	13. Food service
14	A	B	C	D	E	14. Cluster meeting rooms
15	A	B	C	D	E	15. Session meeting rooms
16	A	B	C	D	E	16. Hotel personnel
17	A	B	C	D	E	17. Overall hotel quality
18	A	B	C	D	E	18. Parking arrangements
19	A	B	C	D	E	19. Hotel temperature
20	A	B	C	D	E	20. Hotel lighting
21	A	B	C	D	E	21. Hotel security
22	A	B	C	D	E	
23	A	B	C	D	E	
24	A	B	C	D	E	
25	A	B	C	D	E	

Rating scale: Not Applicable = Blank
A = Very unsatisfactory
B = Less than satisfactory
C = Somewhat satisfactory
D = Satisfactory
E = Very satisfactory

	1 (T)	2 (F)	3		5
26	A	B	C	D	E
27	A	B	C	D	E
28	A	B	C	D	E
29	A	B	C	D	E
30	A	B	C	D	E
31	A	B	C	D	E
32	A	B	C	D	E
33	A	B	C	D	E
34	A	B	C	D	E
35	A	B	C	D	E
36	A	B	C	D	E
37	A	B	C	D	E
38	A	B	C	D	E
39	A	B	C	D	E
40	A	B	C	D	E
41	A	B	C	D	E
42	A	B	C	D	E
43	A	B	C	D	E
44	A	B	C	D	E
45	A	B	C	D	E
46	A	B	C	D	E
47	A	B	C	D	E
48	A	B	C	D	E
49	A	B	C	D	E
50	A	B	C	D	E

DIRECTIONS

Please print the following information:

1. Your name _____
2. Cluster _____

Circle the appropriate category:

1. Student
2. Presenter
3. Cluster Coordinator
4. Graduate

Please use a #2 pencil to darken the oval that indicates your response to each item asked on the reverse side. Please fill in A, B, C, D, or E.

Not Applicable = Blank
A = Very unsatisfactory"
B = Less than satisfactory
C = Somewhat satisfactory
D = Satisfactory
E = Very satisfactory

_____

Comments encouraged: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX E

EVALUATION OF CONCURRENT SESSIONS OF PHE SUMMER INSTITUTE

(FORMATIVE COMPUTER SCOREABLE FORM)

EVALUATION OF CONCURRENT SESSIONS OF
PHE SUMMER INSTITUTE

KEY

	1 (T)	2 (F)	3		5
1	A	B	C	D	E
2	A	B	C	D	E
3	A	B	C	D	E
4	A	B	C	D	E
5	A	B	C	D	E
6	A	B	C	D	E
7	A	B	C	D	E
8	A	B	C	D	E
9	A	B	C	D	E
10	A	B	C	D	E
11	A	B	C	D	E
12	A	B	C	D	E
13	A	B	C	D	E
14	A	B	C	D	E
15	A	B	C	D	E
16	A	B	C	D	E
17	A	B	C	D	E
18	A	B	C	D	E
19	A	B	C	D	E
20	A	B	C	D	E
21	A	B	C	D	E
22	A	B	C	D	E
23	A	B	C	D	E
24	A	B	C	D	E
25	A	B	C	D	E

Directions are below.

1. Educational value
2. Promoted scholarly and intellectual stimulation
3. Audience participation and questions were encouraged
4. Availability of presenter(s) to students
5. Quality of handouts
6. Quality of audio visual
7. Extent to which the presenter was well prepared
8. Relevancy to your needs
9. Clarity of presentation (organization)
10. Clarity of presentation (voice projection)
11. Pace of presentation
12. Relationship to institute theme

DIRECTIONS

Please print the following information:

1. Concurrent session number _____
2. Your name _____
3. Cluster _____
4. Today's date _____

Circle the appropriate category:

a. Student
b. Presenter
c. Cluster Coordinator
d. Graduate

Please use a #2 pencil to darken the oval that indicates your response to each item. Please fill in A, B, C, D, or E.

Not Applicable = Blank
A = Very unsatisfactory
B = Less than satisfactory
C = Somewhat satisfactory
D = Satisfactory
E = Very satisfactory

KEY

	1 (T)	2 (F)	3		5
26	A	B	C	D	E
27	A	B	C	D	E
28	A	B	C	D	E
29	A	B	C	D	E
30	A	B	C	D	E
31	A	B	C	D	E
32	A	B	C	D	E
33	A	B	C	D	E
34	A	B	C	D	E
35	A	B	C	D	E
36	A	B	C	D	E
37	A	B	C	D	E
38	A	B	C	D	E
39	A	B	C	D	E
40	A	B	C	D	E
41	A	B	C	D	E
42	A	B	C	D	E
43	A	B	C	D	E
44	A	B	C	D	E
45	A	B	C	D	E
46	A	B	C	D	E
47	A	B	C	D	E
48	A	B	C	D	E
49	A	B	C	D	E
50	A	B	C	D	E

Comments encouraged: _____

APPENDIX F

A SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF NOVA UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION SUMMER INSTITUTES

A Summary of Recommendations for the Improvement of Nova University Programs for Higher Education Summer Institutes

Area	Recommendation
Time Frames	Breaks between sessions could be made shorter, to about 15 minutes.
Equal Attention to All Specialization Areas	Provide more related concurrent sessions for Vocational, Technical, Occupational and Adult Education Specializations.
	Provide a "Birds of a Feather"-type activity for Vocational, Technical, and Occupational as well as Adult Education Specializations.
Keynote Speaker	Recruit a "top draw" keynote speaker using creative financing approaches.
Support Materials	Audio tapes could be made of all sessions and made available to anyone by check-out from the institute office.
	Handouts for each presentation should be made available in sufficient supply during presentations. Copies should be filed at the institute office for prompt duplication per request.
Communication	The provision of a daily program integration hour by specialization area would tend to enhance learning and networking.
Concurrent Sessions	The concurrent session topics could be integrated with specialization topics.

A Summary of Recommendations for the Improvement of
Nova University Programs for Higher Education
Summer Institutes
(Continued)

Area	Recommendation
Stress Management	An evening "Stress Management" relaxation training (experiential) program could be offered every other night. The level of observed and expressed "stress" at the summer institute is high. This program would also tend to facilitate communication and would be a healthy alternative to alcohol.
Evaluation Forms	The 1987 forms should be "computer readable." The new forms should be tested for internal consistency by having a small group of students read the forms. The following items on the 1986 Overall Evaluation should be stricken from the 1987 forms: 5. The number of planning meetings. 6. The value of planning meetings. Reference to coffee breaks should be modified to read "refreshment breaks." The Evaluation of Concurrent Session forms should have a session identification code space for participants to fill in. This would make the collating of the forms an easier task.

A Summary of Recommendations for the Improvement of
Nova University Programs for Higher Education
Summer Institutes
(Continued)

Area	Recommendation
	It could be communicated to students that in order to receive credit for the summer institute--evaluation forms would need to be completed and returned to their cluster coordinator. Nova administrators should devise a workable plan for the collection of evaluation forms from cluster coordinators and presenters (for their feedback is important also).
Future Institute Planning	Conduct a needs assessment among the students that will focus on (a) summer institute needs and, (b) general academic program needs.
Campus Tour	The campus tour should be better organized and led by a fellow professional. A fact sheet could be developed and distributed to all on the tour.
Evening Advisors	The use of second and third year students as "peer advisors" would probably be helpful for many students. Evening hours would make it possible for interested students to make one-on-one appointments. Some scheduled evening hour advisement by Practicum and MARP advisors would also meet the needs of many students who are over-whelmed by daytime activities.

A Summary of Recommendations for the Improvement of Nova University Programs for Higher Education Summer Institutes (Continued)

Area	Recommendation
Opening Reception	Continue to provide a quality reception.
Registration Forms	Procedures should be developed by Programs for Higher Education Administrators to insure that all students and graduates in attendance at future summer institutes complete registration forms.